



CRM-M-61957-2024

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

108

CRM-M-61957-2024

Date of decision: 20th November, 2025

Daljit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. G.P.S. Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 18 dated 27.01.2024 registered under Sections 302, 120-B read with Section 34 of IPC (Section 201 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Nirmal Kaur on 27.01.2024 alleging that her daughter Rajdeep Kaur was married with Manjinder Singh son of the petitioner about 07 years back and had been living in USA along with the latter. Manjinder Singh used to misbehave with her and used to pressurize her for transferring her property in his name so as to get a green card and is to call his parents residing in Punjab to USA. In January, 2023, Manjinder Singh had sent Rajdeep Kaur to India to attend marriage of some relative. She along with her son had come to India and stayed in the house of



had received a voice message from victim Rajdeep Kaur showing herself to be in some trouble. On the very next day, intimation regarding death of victim had been received. The complainant reached India on 25.01.2024 and was informed that the victim had died due to inhalation of gas emanating from a heater kept in their room. Suspecting some foul play, she prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Post mortem examination of the dead body and inquest proceedings were conducted. The petitioner and her husband were arrested on 27.01.2024. On interrogation, her husband suffered disclosure statement to the effect that the victim was sexually assaulted by him on the night of 19.01.2024. The petitioner had caught hold of her legs and then by putting a pillow on her face, her husband had killed the victim. As per the post-mortem examination report, the cause of death was due to suffocation/smothering.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. There is no eye-witness to the occurrence. She had been suffering from cancer and is an ailing person. The death had not occurred due to strangulation. The case is based on circumstantial evidence and there is no circumstance to connect her with the crime. There is delay in lodging of the FIR. Her further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. It is, therefore, urged that she deserves to be released on bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that the health condition of the petitioner is stable. Prayer made by her for grant of interim bail on medical ground has already been rejected. There are serious



allegations against the petitioner as she in connivance with her husband had killed the victim who is none other than her daughter-in-law and had come from abroad to attend the marriage. The death of the victim was homicidal. Prolonged incarceration cannot be a ground to extend benefit of bail to the petitioner in such like cases. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner in connivance with her husband is alleged to have caused homicidal death of the victim as on the night of 19.01.2024. The death occurred in suspicious circumstances in the house of the petitioner. The post mortem report *prima facie* suggests it to be a case of homicidal death. The allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against her, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

20th November, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned
2. Whether reportable

: Yes / No
: Yes / No